Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

\boxtimes	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supple	emental
LRB	Number	09-3142/1		Intro	duction Nu	mber S	B-263	
Descr Criteri the ex	a for determin	ning indigency f making author	or purposes of rep	resentat	tion by the Stat	e Public De	efender ar	nd requiring
Fiscal	Effect							
	No State Fisco Indeterminate Increase Increase Appropria Appropria Create No	e Existing tions Existing	☐ Increase E Revenues ☐ Decrease Revenues	s Existing	to a	rease Costs absorb withi Yes crease Cos	in agency	
Local:	No Local Gor Indeterminate 1. Increase Permiss 2. Decrease	e Costs sive 🔲 Mandate	3. Increase Fory Permissive 4. Decrease	e 🔲 Mai Revenu	Gov ndatory	es of Local vernment Ur Towns [Counties [School [Districts	nits Affect Village Others WTCS District	Citi e s
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS								
Agen	cy/Prepared	Ву	Auth	orized	Signature			Date
SPD/ Mike Tobin (608) 266-8259 Krista				a Ginger (608) 264-8572				9/1/2009

Fiscal Estimate Narratives SPD 9/1/2009

LRB Number	09-3142/1	Introduction Number	SB-263	Estimate Type	Original				
Description		•							
Criteria for determining indigency for purposes of representation by the State Public Defender and requiring									
the exercise of	f rule-making authorit	ty	•		. •				

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

The State Public Defender (SPD) is statutorily authorized and required to appoint attorneys to represent indigent defendants in criminal proceedings. The SPD plays a major role in ensuring that the Wisconsin justice system complies with the right to counsel provided by both the state and federal constitutions. Any legislation that creates a new criminal offense or expands the definition of an existing criminal offense has the potential to increase SPD costs.

Although this bill neither creates new criminal offenses, nor changes penalties, it would increase the number of SPD cases by updating the SPD financial eligibility criteria. These criteria have remained the same, without adjustments for inflation, since 1987, with the consequence that many applicants of low income (below the federal poverty level) do not presently qualify for SPD representation.

Because the proposed effective date is June 19, 20011, the SPD would not incur increased costs during the 2009-11 biennium. As the proposed changes are implemented, the SPD estimates additional costs in FY 2012 of \$3,800,000. The estimated annual cost attributable to the changes proposed in this bill would be \$4,100,000, once fully implemented, beginning in FY 2013. These estimates are based upon average SPD costs and a study of applications for SPD services, which showed that the SPD would provide representation in an additional 12,800 cases annually if these changes take effect. In general, the number of criminal charges filed and statewide economic conditions are significant variables affecting the number of SPD cases.

Much, if not all, of the increased costs will be offset by reductions in county expenditures for the appointment of counsel. Reports from 69 of Wisconsin's 72 counties showed county expenditures in 2008 of approximately \$6,000,000 for this type of appointment. Many applicants who exceed the SPD's statutory financial guidelines are constitutionally eligible for appointment of counsel because it would be a substantial hardship for them to retain an attorney. The court is required to appoint counsel at county expense for these applicants. This bill would greatly decrease the number of applicants for court-appointed attorneys in criminal cases because the revised SPD financial criteria would result in SPD appointments in most of the cases in which courts currently appoint attorneys at county expense.

Counties would save the direct costs of these appointments, and county officials would not have to spend as much time administering court appointments, including auditing and paying invoices. The counties may also experience savings because in cases in which the SPD is able to appoint an attorney, the case may be resolved more quickly than if there is a delay to determine whether the court should appoint an attorney. In many cases, the prompt appointment of an attorney may result in fewer court hearings, less jail time, or both.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications